

**HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD**

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**23 March 2006**

These minutes summarize the discussions and presentations from the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thursday, March 23, 2006, in the Alex L. Pitcher, Jr. Room at the Southeast Community Facility at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS). A verbatim transcript was also prepared for the meeting and is available in the information repository for HPS and on the Internet at <http://www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/hps/default.aspx>. The list of agenda topics is provided below. Attachment A provides a list of attendees. Attachment B includes action items that were requested or committed to by RAB members during the meeting.

**AGENDA TOPICS:**

- (1) Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review
- (2) Approval of Meeting Minutes from the January 26, 2006 and February 23, 2006 RAB Meetings
- (3) Navy Announcements
- (4) Community Co-Chair Report
- (5) Parcel B Technical Memorandum in Support of a Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment (TMSRA) Presentation
- (6) Subcommittee Reports
- (7) Community Comment Period
- (8) Adjournment

**MEETING HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda for March 23, 2006, RAB Meeting
- Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2006 and February 23, 2006 RAB Meetings
- Navy Monthly Progress Report, March 23, 2006
- PowerPoint Presentation, Parcel B Update – Technical Memorandum in Support of a ROD Amendment
- Membership Bylaws Community Outreach (MBCO) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes from March 15, 2006

**Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review**

Marsha Pendergrass, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Pendergrass welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves and the organization they represent. Ms. Pendergrass confirmed that there is a quorum for the meeting.

**Approval of Minutes from the January 26, 2006 and February 23, 2006 RAB Meeting**

Ms. Pendergrass said that approval of the minutes is needed for the RAB meetings on January 26, 2006 and February 23, 2006. It was noted that a correction is needed on the February RAB Meeting Minutes on page 1, line 37; change the year from 2005 to 2006. Keith Tisdell, RAB member, motioned to vote on approving the minutes. Charles Dacus, RAB member, seconded the motion. Ms. Pendergrass asked the RAB to vote on the January and February 2006 meeting minutes. The RAB meeting minutes were approved with one abstention, and the minutes were accepted into the record.

Ms. Pendergrass addressed the status of the action items:

**Carry-over Action Item Number 1:** Pat Brooks, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), to provide a list of all businesses in the Bayview Community that have been retained by the Navy contractors. This action item was completed and will be removed from the table.

**Carry-over Action Item Number 2:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to schedule a field trip in June 2006 to visit the Parcel C Treatability Study Site. This action item will be carried over until May 2006.

**Carry-over Action Item Number 3:** Chris Hanif, Young Community Developers (YCD), to meet with James Morrison, RAB member, and Jesse Mason, RAB member, to debrief on the Economic Subcommittee and schedule the next meeting. This action item will be carried over until April 2006.

**Carry-over Action Item Number 4:** Keith Forman, HPS Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator, (BEC) to provide Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Ray Tompkins, RAB member, with a list of HPS 2006 Priority Projects, including projects that overlap into 2007. Ms. Bushnell asked that the list be provided to the HPS RAB. This action item will be carried over until March 27, 2006.

**Carry-over Item Number 5:** Keith Forman to provide an Environmental 101 class on a Saturday once at least 3 new community members join the RAB. Mr. Tisdell indicated that there are two applicants being considered for RAB membership, and the RAB will be meeting one applicant this evening. This action item will be carried over until there are at least 3 new RAB members.

**Carry-over Item Number 2:** Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech EMI, to circulate announcements for the upcoming Membership Bylaws and Community Outreach Subcommittee and Technical Subcommittee Meetings. This item was completed and will be removed from the table.

**New Action Item Number 1:** James Ponton, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), will provide a presentation on Water Board activities for HPS at the April 27, 2006 RAB meeting. There will then be a regulator presentation at each RAB meeting, with Michael Work, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) providing a presentation on EPA activities at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting. This action item will be completed at the April 27, 2006 RAB Meeting.

### **Navy Announcements**

Mr. Forman said that thanks are due Mr. Morrison for conducting a good Economic Subcommittee meeting. He added that he wants to encourage more RAB members to attend the meeting to support Mr. Morrison in his efforts. Mr. Forman added that during the MBCO Subcommittee meeting, there were a lot of good ideas for RAB recruitment suggested, and a booth to provide information on the HPS program is being considered for the local farmers market. The Navy RPMs would staff a booth at the farmers market to provide presentations and be available to the public to answer questions.

Mr. Forman announced that the next Technical Subcommittee meeting is on Wednesday, March 29, 2006. This will be the final meeting for review of various HPS Groundwater Program documents.

1    **Community Co-Chair Report**

2    Ms. Bushnell stated that there has been no word from the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency  
3    Citizen's Advisory Council (CAC) on providing a CAC representative to sit on the RAB. She  
4    has spoken to several individuals who are interested in HPS RAB membership, but it does take  
5    time to get people on board for membership. A tour of the shipyard will hopefully encourage  
6    people to get involved; this will be scheduled when the weather improves. She added that  
7    Captain Pardini of the Bayview Police Department publishes a weekly bulletin and she will  
8    touch base with him to ensure a regular HPS RAB announcement is added.

9    Dr. Tompkins announced that an ad for Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) applicants was placed  
10   in the Bayview newspaper last week. Candidates will be interviewed as soon as possible and the  
11   plan is to have a TAG representative on board by the first week in April 2006.

12   **Parcel B Technical Memorandum in Support of Record of Decision Amendment**  
13   **(Presentation)**

14   Mr. Forman and Mr. Brooks provided an update of the Parcel B Technical Memorandum in  
15   Support of a Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment (TMSRA). This is a very important  
16   document that will be issued for review on March 28, 2006. A RAB subcommittee meeting will  
17   be held at a later date to delve into the TMSRA in more detail.

18   Mr. Forman provided a history of Parcel B. The Parcel B ROD was signed in 1998. The ROD  
19   documents the selection of a set of cleanup remedies for this parcel. Once the ROD was  
20   finalized, work plans were prepared and remediation activities at Parcel B took place from 1999  
21   to 2002. Major excavations to various depths were performed over much of the parcel.  
22   Sampling indicated that the assumptions used to develop the remedies in the ROD did not match  
23   the conditions and contaminants found during excavation. The ROD assumed that there was a  
24   certain distribution of contaminants in the soil with a definite source area. During excavation,  
25   soil conditions were found to be heterogeneous; the levels of metals and contaminants in soil did  
26   not form a definite pattern. It became apparent that the 1998 ROD was not a good fit for Parcel  
27   B. Some of the soil cleanup goals in the ROD were not easily achievable. Active remediation  
28   was found to be necessary for groundwater contamination; the 1998 ROD did not provide active  
29   remedies. This is not an ideal situation because in the normal CERCLA process, Parcel B  
30   remediation would be near completion. Mr. Brooks added that Parcel B is most likely the next  
31   parcel that will be transferred to the City of San Francisco.

32   Mr. Forman stated that the Navy has prepared the TMSRA to bridge the gap between the 1998  
33   ROD and the conditions found during remedial action. The TMSRA presents the case for a  
34   ROD Amendment to the regulatory agencies and the public, and provides appropriate  
35   alternatives for Parcel B. He explained that after the TMSRA is finalized, the amended Parcel B  
36   ROD will be prepared. Mr. Brooks explained that for Parcel B there are three areas that need to  
37   be addressed – soil, groundwater, and the shoreline of the San Francisco Bay. The TMSRA will  
38   provide alternatives for these three areas, and a ranking based on the strengths and weaknesses of  
39   each alternative.

40   Mr. Brooks indicated that the components of the soil remediation alternatives include  
41   institutional controls (ICs), shoreline protection, excavation and disposal of chemical  
42   compounds, covers to ensure no exposure to metals, and soil vapor extraction for solvents. ICs  
43   are included in the deed for Parcel B to restrict land uses and activities. They also protect the  
44   remedies and guarantee access rights for the Navy to keep the remedies functional. Excavation  
45   and disposal would be conducted to remove chemicals that were spilled into the soil. Covers  
46   would be used to ensure that the public is not exposed to bare soil at Parcel B. Soil vapor

1 extraction would be performed to remove degreasing solvents that were released into the soil  
2 during parts cleaning activities.

3 Mr. Forman said that there are five remediation alternatives for soil. The first alternative, no  
4 action, is used as a baseline to compare all the other alternatives and is required by law. The  
5 second alternative includes ICs and shoreline protection. The third alternative includes  
6 excavation and disposal of chemical contamination, ICs, and shoreline protection. The fourth  
7 alternative includes soil covers, ICs, and shoreline protection. The fifth alternative includes  
8 excavation and disposal of chemical contamination, soil covers, vapor extraction, ICs, and  
9 shoreline protection. Mr. Brooks then discussed each of the components of the remedial  
10 alternatives.

11 Institutional Controls – Mr. Brooks explained that the Navy and DTSC have an agreement that is  
12 the basis for formulating ICs. The agreement ensures controls “run with the land”; that means  
13 property can be sold multiple times and the ICs remain the same. The agreement also provides  
14 an enforcement mechanism if the property owner is not following the restrictions. For example,  
15 for HPS the City of San Francisco is required to produce a soil and groundwater management  
16 plan to ensure safety when excavating soil and pumping groundwater. ICs also restrict certain  
17 activities. First, the covers and any part of the remedies are not to be disturbed, and repairs have  
18 to be made if they are disturbed. There is also a restriction on growing vegetables for human  
19 consumption, unless it is done in clean topsoil. Excavating soil or extracting groundwater is  
20 restricted unless activities follow the soil and groundwater management plan produced by the  
21 City. The final component of ICs is access for the Navy to monitor, maintain, or repair the  
22 remedies as needed.

23 Shoreline Protection – Mr. Brooks explained that the objectives of the shoreline protection  
24 components are to eliminate exposure to contaminated soil or sediment that is along the shoreline  
25 and prevent migration of contaminated soil from upland areas to the bay. Parcel B has some  
26 areas with existing vertical concrete seawalls. Additional shoreline protection will be constructed  
27 along the entire shoreline where there is no sea wall. This consists of rocks of various sizes (rip  
28 rap) placed above a geofabric that protects the bay from contamination and ties into the soil in  
29 the upland area. The soil cover will go down to the mean low water level and is a robust  
30 protection of shoreline. Excavation of about 6,000 cubic yards of soil for disposal is included to  
31 remove any contamination from the shoreline area.

32 Excavation – Mr. Brooks indicated that to date, approximately 250,000 cubic yards of soil has  
33 been transported from the shipyard, and this is an easy and effective remediation alternative.  
34 Soil contaminated with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and lead above remediation  
35 goals will be excavated along with the source of methane gas at Site 7. Once source removal is  
36 complete, backfill with clean soil is recommended all across Site 7. A figure showing the  
37 excavation locations was provided.

38 Covers – Mr. Brooks stated that covers will be placed to prevent exposure to any contaminants in  
39 the soil. Two of the soil contaminants are manganese and arsenic, which are a part of the natural  
40 soil at HPS, and a source area has not been identified. A cover is a good solution to preventing  
41 exposure to these chemicals. The covers will be applied over entire blocks based on the  
42 redevelopment plan to ensure the remedy matches the intended reuse of the property. In  
43 addition, covers by block are easier to implement and to enforce restrictions. Parcel B already  
44 has existing covers including buildings, roads, parking lots, and vegetated areas where native soil  
45 is not exposed. Asphalt or clean soil covers will be placed wherever existing coverage is not  
46 considered adequate. A figure showing the areas requiring coverage was provided. He added  
47 that it will look a lot like downtown San Francisco, with buildings, roadways, sidewalks,

maintained landscaping, and the Bay Trail. Once the entire shipyard has been transferred, the Bay Trail can be installed along the edge of the shipyard.

Mr. Brooks explained that the components of the remediation alternatives for groundwater include ICs, groundwater monitoring, and in-situ treatment of the Site 10 solvent plume. There are three groundwater alternatives, 1) no action, 2) long-term monitoring and institutional controls, and 3) in-situ treatment, groundwater monitoring, and institutional controls. In-situ simply means treatment in the ground right where contaminants are located.

**Institutional Controls** – Mr. Brooks explained that groundwater use is prohibited as part of restricted land uses. He added that the groundwater at HPS is not good quality, and groundwater wells are already prohibited throughout the City of San Francisco. Mr. Brooks stated that Northern California receives drinking water from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and groundwater wells are not necessary for drinking water. Restricted activities cover excavation below the water table, which would prevent a storm drain or sewer line being installed through a groundwater plume. Restricted activities also prohibit damage to groundwater monitoring wells. ICs also provide access rights for groundwater monitoring. The biggest restriction is on occupancy of buildings above solvent plumes without engineering controls (vapor barriers). Chemicals in groundwater can vaporize and migrate into buildings, posing health risks even at low levels. The vapor barriers are as simple as lining a building foundation or drawing vapor from underneath a foundation slab.

**Groundwater Monitoring** – Mr. Brooks stated that the groundwater sampling goals are to monitor movement of contaminant plumes, especially toward the bay, and monitor changes in concentrations within a plume. Monitoring changes in concentrations in the plumes will determine how effective the remediation is, and in the future the treatability study at Site 10 will provide lessons on improving groundwater quality. Groundwater monitoring at Parcel B will involve 26 wells, with most of the wells at Site 10 monitoring the solvent plume near Bldg 153. The Navy will also monitor mercury at Site 26, chromium at Site 10, and a solvent plume near the Parcel C boundary. He stated that the Site 10 solvent plume is where the zero-valent iron treatability study helped lower the plume concentrations. The highest solvent concentrations were initially over 1000 micrograms per liter for trichloroethylene (TCE) and after treatment were down to 90 micrograms per liter in December 2005. Similarly, the concentration of vinyl chloride has also gone down. Soil vapor extraction is also being performed in the solvent plume area to prevent solvents trapped in the soil from reaching the groundwater.

**In-Situ Treatment** – Mr. Brooks indicated that both bioremediation and zero valent iron injection are being evaluated for in-situ treatment at Site 10. At Parcel C Remedial Unit 5, bioremediation has done a good job of reducing groundwater concentrations. Zero valent iron treatment was shown to be successful in tests conducted at Parcel B. The Parcel B in-situ treatment would consist of one injection of 3,300 pounds of lactate for bioremediation, or 44,000 pounds of zero valent iron. The treatment area is about 4,000 square feet and is centered on the wells with the highest solvent concentrations.

Mr. Brooks provided a chart showing ratings of the soil and groundwater alternatives based on 9 criteria. There are two threshold criteria: 1) Overall protection of human health and the environment, and 2) Compliance with Applicable, Relevant, and Appropriate Requirements [ARARs]. There are also five balancing criteria: 1) Long-term effectiveness and permanence, 2) Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or Volume through Treatment, 3) Short-term effectiveness, 4) Implementability, and 5) Cost. Two criteria not listed are public and regulatory acceptance of the alternatives and those criteria will be evaluated with the Proposed Plan.

1 Mr. Brooks reviewed Site 26 where there are still mercury detections slightly above cleanup  
2 goals. In the mid-1990s, there was an excavation performed to address about 15 chemicals of  
3 concern, but primarily mercury. Elemental mercury, the silver liquid you see in thermometers,  
4 was observed in the soil during the excavations. The excavation was performed down to  
5 approximately 10 feet in all locations, removing about 5,500 cubic yards of contaminated soil.  
6 After collecting over 300 samples, the edges of the mercury contamination were identified and  
7 the cleanup goals (2.3 parts per million (ppm) for soil) were met at the excavation sidewalls.  
8 Some samples collected from the bottom of the excavation, however, did not meet the cleanup  
9 goals, with the highest mercury detection at 90 ppm. There is one groundwater well  
10 (IR26MW47A) that still exceeds cleanup levels (0.6 ppm for groundwater), and it's the well  
11 nearest to the Bay. The mercury level in that well varies, but never gets much above the cleanup  
12 goal. The excavation is being evaluated to determine if it was effective, and an additional well  
13 will be installed closer to the Bay. The Navy has also discussed this issue with the regulators to  
14 see if more wells are recommended. The mercury levels are so close to the cleanup goals that  
15 additional excavation may not be beneficial, but mercury in groundwater is a complicated issue.  
16 If mercury levels closer to the Bay are much higher than in the current well, further excavation  
17 would be necessary to find a source area that was missed.

18 Mr. Forman stated that the TMSRA will be issued for review on March 28, 2006, with a  
19 Technical Subcommittee Meeting to review the document scheduled in April 2006. Comments  
20 are due on May 11, 2006. Mr. Forman explained that the Navy is open to further dialogue on the  
21 TMSRA and either he or Ms. Bushnell can be contacted to request further meetings.

22 Ms. Bushnell explained that she once had a test tube that contained elemental mercury and it  
23 would separate into small balls and then combine again together. She noted it was a poisonous  
24 substance. Mr. Brooks added that it is a toxic metal with unusual chemical properties. Mercury  
25 forms vapors and also tends to sorb to soil particles once it's in groundwater.

26 Ms. Rines asked why the soil alternative S4 did not include excavation and disposal. Julia  
27 Vetromile, Tetra Tech EMI, replied that the basic concept in the TMSRA is to have a range of  
28 alternatives for evaluation, so one alternative includes covers with no excavation, one includes  
29 excavation with no covers, and the last alternative includes both covers and excavation.

30 Ms. Rines asked what agency would be responsible for enforcement if a property owner is not  
31 following the land-use restrictions. Mr. Brooks responded that DTSC can empower other  
32 agencies to enforce the restrictions, and the lead enforcement agency is usually a local or state  
33 agency like the Department of Public Health.

34 Jean Ellingsen, San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, asked who is paying for these remedies. Mr.  
35 Forman replied that HPS is part of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program, and the  
36 US Congress appropriates the funds for cleanup. The BRAC program is currently in a phase  
37 where some property has been sold for millions of dollars, which provides some of the funds for  
38 BRAC cleanup activities.

39 Susan Marin-Oglove, San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, asked if the Navy has easement rights on  
40 all of the HPS land. Mr. Forman replied that the Department of the Navy is the current property  
41 owner, and will continue to be the owner until the property is transferred to the City of San  
42 Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Ms. Marin-Oglove asked if the Navy would still have  
43 easements rights once the property is transferred. Mr. Forman replied that the Navy would retain  
44 a right of access to review remedies, do operations and maintenance on remedies, and conduct 5-  
45 year reviews. Ms. Marin-Oglove asked if that means there can be no buildings on the property.  
46 Mr. Forman responded that the Navy's right to access is distinct from other restrictions that limit  
47 what can be developed on the site without further work or regulatory approval.

1 Amy Brownell, San Francisco Department of Public Health, stated that Mr. Brooks discussed  
2 serpentinite rock in the presentation and there is no need for a cover for serpentinite rock. She  
3 added that HPS was built using unregulated fill material and there is no way to know the  
4 constituents of that fill or how it was placed, so that was a factor in deciding on the covers. The  
5 alternative would be to excavate the entire base to remove the fill material, but then there would  
6 be no land to transfer.

7 Mr. Forman explained that the covers are going to be placed based on redevelopment blocks  
8 because it is easier to implement the remedy and to enforce land-use restrictions. That is the  
9 easiest and most conservative approach. Ms. Pendergrass asked if there is full coverage does  
10 that mean there will be no green space. Mr. Forman replied that some of the blocks would have  
11 vegetated cover. For example, the City's reuse plan includes a strip of open space right along the  
12 Bay Trail and that will be vegetated cover. In addition, there could be raised planters for  
13 vegetation like those throughout urban spaces.

14 Mr. Dacus asked if there is a tentative transfer date for Parcel B. Mr. Forman responded that  
15 there are a lot of hurdles in the process, which involves the ROD amendment, designing a plan  
16 that the community and regulatory agencies accept, conducting the remediation, and then  
17 proving that the remedy is working. After the remedy is in place, a Finding of Suitability to  
18 Transfer has to be prepared, so the tentative transfer date is early 2010.

## 19 **Subcommittee Reports**

### 20 **Economic Subcommittee**

21 Mr. Morrison said that the subcommittee is starting off correctly with an agenda and a sign-in  
22 sheet. He indicated that the meeting minutes from the March 2006 meeting will be available  
23 soon.

24 Mr. Morrison stated that the bottom line for the Economic Subcommittee is money. The  
25 Bayview/HPS businesses and citizens want a bigger share of the pie. Currently the major share  
26 seems to go to a handful of companies that are not a part of the Bayview community. The  
27 Economic Subcommittee's objective is to see how local companies can be mentored or become  
28 subcontractors with Tetra Tech, ITSI, and other Navy subcontractors. The subcommittee is also  
29 asking the Navy's contractors to explain why they do not have more subcontracts with local  
30 community businesses. He added that he found out that the subcontractors require funding to  
31 attend the meetings and present their plans. There was a presentation from Ronald Batiste, Eagle  
32 Environmental Construction (EEC), and he may be able to facilitate this issue. There are also  
33 local companies that the subcommittee will be interviewing so they can get a larger share of  
34 business and more jobs for the community. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April  
35 26, 2006 at the Bayview Police Station.

### 36 **Technical Review Subcommittee**

37 Ms. Bushnell indicated that the Technical Review Subcommittee will be meeting next  
38 Wednesday, March 29, 2006, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at the Anna Waden Library. She will  
39 provide an update on the meeting at the April 27, 2006 RAB meeting.

### 40 **MBCO Subcommittee**

41 Mr. Tisdell explained that an application for HPS RAB membership has been submitted by  
42 Robert Van Houten, Morgan Heights Homeowners Association, who has been approved by the  
43 MBCO Subcommittee. Mr. Tisdell made a motion that the RAB accept his application to  
44 become a RAB member and Ms. Bushnell seconded the motion. The RAB unanimously  
45 accepted him for membership with no abstentions.

1 Mr. Forman stated that Mr. Van Houten represents the Morgan Heights Homeowners  
2 Association that is located close to the shipyard and he is already being proactive. On Monday,  
3 May 1, 2006, Mr. Forman is scheduled to provide a presentation to the Morgan Heights  
4 Homeowners Association on the progress made and future activities planned for HPS. The next  
5 MBCO meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 12, 2006 at the Anna Waden Library.

#### 6 **RAB Comment Period**

7 Mr. Tisdell announced that he has a new job with Tetra Tech EC as the Parcel E guard shack  
8 monitor. He wanted to inform the RAB so he can step down if there are any concerns about a  
9 conflict of interest. Ms. Pendergrass responded that if he is required to step down, anyone who is  
10 hired by a Navy contractor would have to step down and that would be contrary to the Economic  
11 Subcommittee's objective. Ms. Rines added that a RAB member who is employed by one of the  
12 Navy's contractors could not be in a position to influence RAB decisions. Ms. Pendergrass  
13 clarified that that would mean that Mr. Tisdell would have to abstain from any votes that involve  
14 Tetra Tech EC. Mr. Forman stated that his recommendation is for full disclosure and to abstain  
15 from any vote where there's a conflict. Ms. Bushnell added that since the RAB does not make  
16 any contractual decisions she does not foresee any potential conflict of interest.

17 Mr. Tisdell asked if anyone on the RAB has a contact for someone who coordinates the Third  
18 Street Fair, please contact Ms. Bushnell or Mr. Forman with that information.

19 Mr. Tisdell indicated that in working out at HPS he has observed that the redevelopment  
20 contractors are still not using dust control measures. They are grinding concrete without any  
21 water, and he keeps seeing dust flying from where he is working. This issue was even discussed  
22 at the February 25, 2006 San Francisco Redevelopment Agency CAC meeting. Ms. Brownell  
23 noted that she is a liaison with Lennar and the Redevelopment Agency and would take this  
24 comment back to them. She added that there is a 24-hour phone line (866-5-Lennar) to report  
25 anything positive or negative about activities at HPS. Lennar uses subcontractors at HPS, so  
26 calling the 24-hour phone line is the best way to get a response. She added that she can be  
27 contacted by phone or e-mail if there is no response from Lennar.

28 Ms. Pendergrass adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

29 **Reminder: The next RAB meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday,**  
30 **April 27, 2006, at the Southeast Community Commission Facility, Room 313, 1800 Oakdale**  
31 **Avenue, San Francisco, California 94124.**



**ATTACHMENT A**  
**23 March 2006 - RAB MEETING**  
**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Association</b>
1. Wayne Akiyama	Shaw Environmental
2. Patricia Brown	Shipyard Artist
3. Amy Brownell	San Francisco Department of Public Health
4. Barbara Bushnell	RAB Co-chair, Resident of the Southeast Sector (ROSES)
5. Charles Dacus	RAB member, ROSES
6. Jean Ellingsen	San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
7. Keith Forman	Navy RAB Co-chair
8. Robert Franklin	Young Community Developers
9. Carolyn Hunter	Tetra Tech EMI
10. Jaqueline Ann Lane	U.S. EPA Region IX
11. Tom Lanphar	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
12. Johnson Ly	Young Community Developers
13. Kevin McCorry	Audio Visual Headquarters (AVHQ)
14. Susan Merin-Oglove	San Francisco Civil Grand Jury
15. Brandy Moore	Audio Visual Headquarters (AVHQ)
16. James Morrison	RAB member, ROSES
17. Christine M. Niccoli	Niccoli Reporting, court reporter
18. Ralph Pearce	Navy RPM
19. Marsha Pendergrass	Pendergrass & Associates
20. Jim Ponton	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
21. Melita Rines	RAB member, India Basin Neighborhood Association
22. Maurice Robinson	Young Community Developers
23. Gerard Slattery	Tetra Tech EC
24. Peter Stroganoff	Navy, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction (ROICC) Office
25. Keith Tisdell	RAB member, Resident
26. Raymond Tompkins	RAB member, Bayview-Hunters Point Health and the Environment
27. Robert Van Houten	RAB member, Morgan Heights Resident
28. Julia Vetromile	Tetra Tech EMI
29. Olin Webb	RSI
30. Angela Williams	Barajas & Associates
31. Michael Work	U.S. EPA Region IX

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**23 MARCH 2006 – RAB MEETING**  
**ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Person Authoring the Action Item</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Person/Agency Committing to Action Item</b>	<b>Resolution Status</b>
<b>Carry-Over Items</b>					
1.	The Navy will provide a list of all businesses in the Bayview Community that have been retained by the Navy Contractors	James Morrison RAB member	1/26/06	Pat Brooks Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager	This action item was completed
2.	The Navy will schedule a RAB field trip in June 2006 to visit the Parcel C RU C1 Treatability Study Site.	Keith Forman Navy RAB Co-chair	2/23/06	Mr. Forman	This action item will be revisited at the May 25, 2006 RAB Meeting
3.	Chris Hanif, Young Community Developers, to meet with James Morrison (RAB member), and Jesse Mason (RAB member) to debrief on the Economic Subcommittee and schedule the next meeting.	Chris Hanif YCD	2/23/06	Mr. Hanif	This action item will be revisited at the April 27, 2006 RAB Meeting
4.	The Navy will provide the RAB, U.S. EPA, DTSC, and San Francisco Bay RWQCB a list of the HPS Priority Projects in 2006 (including projects that overlap into 2007).	Ray Tompkins RAB member	2/3/06	Mr. Forman	This action item will be carried over until Monday, March 27, 2006
5.	The Navy will schedule a HPS Environmental 101 class on a Saturday in April 2006 once at least 3 new community members join the RAB.	Mr. Forman	2/23/06	Mr. Forman	This action item will be tabled until there are at least 3 new RAB members
6.	James Ponton, RWQCB, to provide a presentation on RWQCB activities for HPS at the April 27, 2006 RAB meeting.	Regulators	3/23/06	Mr. Ponton	This action item will be completed at the April 27, 2006 RAB Meeting.

June 5, 2006

Diane Silva  
SWDIV Records Manager  
Facilities Engineering Command  
1220 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, CA 92132

Subject: Hunters Point Shipyard Information Repository/Administrative Record Submittals

Dear Ms. Silva,

Enclosed are three copies of the following documents for submittal to the Hunters Point Shipyard Information Repository/Administrative Record:

- Final January 26, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final February 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final February 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final March 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final March 23, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript
- Final April 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
- Final April 27, 2006 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Transcript

Please feel free to contact me or Angela Williams (Community Relations Specialist [619-338-0798, ext. 12]) if you have any questions.

Thank you,



Saravanan (Eli) Vedagiri, P.E.  
Program Manager  
Barajas and Associates, Inc.  
Phone: (619) 338-0798, ext. 11  
Fax: (619) 338-0617  
E-mail: eliv@barajas.cc